

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration and substantive effort given this case. Examiner objected to the specification as containing minor informalities. On page 21, the Examiner recommended that the word “because” be deleted and the word “hence” be inserted between “materials” and “experimental kinetic data.” On page 44, the Examiner stated that two tables were cited with one reference label when two labels were required. Applicants have corrected the above-listed informalities and any text corresponding to these informalities in the specification. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw his objection to the specification.

Examiner has rejected claim 13 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,489,168 to *Wang et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following remarks in support of the traversal.

The Examiner has stated that *Wang et al.* disclose, at column 1, lines 30-55, “a process for the development of scalable, high performance material.” The Examiner has further stated that *Wang et al.* disclose, at column 13, line 29 to column 22, that “the process includes [a] computer assisted knowledge cycle (predictive analysis) that uses experimental data.” However, *Wang et al.* does not disclose using the experimental data “to generate working hypotheses and suggested steps for at least one of experimental investigations and theoretical investigations to guide the search for better materials,” as required by claim 13. Moreover, *Wang et al.* do not describe using “at least one of...(ii) correlations generated from at least one of experimental, theoretical, and/or modeling findings; and (iii) theoretical and modeling investigations to generate working hypotheses and suggested steps for at least one of experimental investigations and theoretical investigations to guide the search for better materials.” Indeed, *Wang et al.* do not disclose generating any hypotheses or suggestions for investigations of new materials. *Wang*

et al. merely describe a data analysis module that processes experimental data, such as temperature measurements, for use in screening materials or for performing quantitative calculations of useful process and product variables (column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 22). Accordingly, *Wang et al.* do not disclose all of the limitations of claim 13, and claim 13 is patentable for at least this reason.

The Examiner has objected to claim 14-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claim 13 has been shown to be patentable over the prior art, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his objections to claims 14-28, which depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 13.

Applicants have amended claims 21, 22 and 26 to correct minor errors. Applicants amended claim 21 to depend from claim 19 instead of claim 13 to provide an antecedent basis for one of the claim terms. Applicants amended claim 22 to correct a typographical error. Applicants amended claim 26 to describe the claimed method more properly. These amendments do not introduce new matter.


Applicants have added claims 29 and 30. Claim 29, which depends from claim 19, finds support in, at least, claim 18. Claim 30 is a new independent claim that finds support, at least, in the specification at paragraphs [0037] and [0038]. Claims 29 and 30 do not introduce new matter. As claim 29 depends indirectly from claim 13, which has been shown to be patentable, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 29. Applicants likewise respectfully request allowance of claim 30.

Applicants submit that the response set forth herein is sufficient to explain the differences between the claimed invention and the Examiner-cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of claims 13-30. In the event that the Examiner is not prepared to grant such an allowance, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner before the next Office Action.

AUTHORIZATION

No fee is believed to be required for the submission of this Amendment and Response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account no. 50-0436.

Respectfully submitted,
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP



Joseph T. Helmsen
Registration No. 54,163

Pepper Hamilton LLP
One Mellon Center, 50th Floor
500 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: 412.454.5000
Facsimile: 412.281.0717
Date: December 1, 2003